

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 were pending in this application prior to this amendment.

Claims 1-20 were rejected.

Claims 1, 12 and 20 have been amended.

Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 as amended is respectfully requested for the reasons explained below.

Amendments have been made to clarify the claims. The amendments do not materially change the scope of the claims. If the claims are not allowed as amended, entry of the amendment is requested in order to clarify the claims for appeal.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Lahey et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,587,217.

As explained in detail in the applicant's response filed 12 December 2005, there are three primary steps recited in applicant's claims.

- 1) a first interface is opened between a workstation and the operational settings in a document processing device.
- 2) a user selects operational settings. The claim recites that the settings are selected through an interface to the workstation and through the first interface.
- 3) the location of the document data file is communicated to the document processing device and the device is activated with the operational settings.

In the response filed 12 December 2005, applicant noted that Lahey transmits the actual data file along with the information indicating how the file should be printed. In the Office action dated 12/29/05 the examiner responds to applicant's argument by noting that at column 6 lines 12-20 Lahey indicates that the "item records" includes the location of the document file. What the examiner has missed is that in Lahey's system the "item record" is modified before it is sent to the printer. At Column 7 lines 20 et. seq. Lacey explains,

"The InfoPrint Submit software 10 then translates the job ticket 40 created thereby to a format compatible with the InfoPrint MPC server 6.

The client computer 4a, b, c transmits this **translated job ticket 40** along with **the items identified in the item records 52, 54** to the InfoPrint MPC server 6 over the network 8". (emphasis added)

Thus, Lahey does transfer the actual files to the printer along with the job ticket as stated by the applicant. This is different from how the system recited in applicant's claim operates.

In the response filed 12 December 2005, applicant also notes that applicant's invention involves opening an interface between the workstation and the operational settings in the document processing device so that the user can modify these setting. In the examiner's response to this augment the examiner indicates that in Lachey, after the user selects a printer, the InfoPrint software modifies the range of print attributes. The examiner states (without any basis in the reference or elsewhere) that the fact that the InfoPrint software modifies the attributes is the "same as" opening an interface. In fact, these are two different ways of modifying the attributes and there is no basis for the examiner's position that they are the "same". They clearly are different techniques for accomplishing related end objects.

It is noted that this is a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and hence it is not even an issue of "obviousness".

For the above reasons applicant respectfully requests allowance of claims 1, 2, 5, 8-10, 12, 13, 15-17 and 20. If these claims are not allowed, entry of the amendment is requested for the purpose of appeal.

It is noted that claims 3, 4 and 7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Lahey in view of Yokoyama (US patent 6,166,826). Claims 3, 4 and 7 are dependent claims that were discussed above. Applicant submits that claims 3, 4 and 7 are patentable for the same reason as explained above relative to the parent claims.

Summary: reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-20 as amended is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at (503) 222-3613 if it appears that a telephone interview would be helpful in advancing the allowance of this application.

It is noted that a notice of appeal is being filed on the same day that this amendment is being filed. The notice of appeal is being filed under a separate cover sheet as recommended by the MPEP.

Customer No. 20575

Respectfully submitted,



Elmer W. Galbi
Registration No. 19,761

MARGER JOHNSON & McCOLLOM, P.C.
210 SW Morrison Street, Suite 400
Portland, OR 97204
(503) 222-3613